



1887. NOW READY. 1887  
THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY  
For 1887,  
With which is incorporated  
THE CHINA TRADE DIRECTORY.  
(TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL ISSUE),  
COMPLETE, WITH APPENDIX, PLANS, &c.,  
Royal 8vo, pp. 1,156.—\$2.00.  
SMALLER EDITION, By 8vo, pp. 775...\$3.00.

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY  
has been thoroughly revised and brought up  
to date, and is again much increased in bulk.  
It contains DESCRIPTIVE and STATISTICAL  
ACCOUNTS of and DIRECTORIES for  
JAPAN—CHINA—TIGER ISLAND—  
HONGKONG—MACAO—  
The Ladies' Directory Nagasaki.  
Do Peck Directory Kobo (Hyogo).  
Do Military Forces Osaka.  
Do Chinese Banks Tokyo.  
MACAO—Ningpo.  
China—Ningpo.  
Fuzhou.  
Wuhsien.  
Canton.  
Swatow.  
Amoy.  
Takao.  
Taiwan.  
Tamsui.  
Keeling.  
Wufong.  
Ningpo.  
Shanghai.  
Chinkiang.  
Wuh.  
Kinkiang.  
Hankow.  
Ihang.  
Changking.  
Taku.  
Tientsin.  
Peking.  
Port Arthur.  
Nanking.  
CORSA—  
Etonian.  
Juchuan.  
Fusan.  
Yunman.  
PORT HAMILTON.  
VADIVOSFOCK.

NAVAL SQUADRONS—  
British—French.  
United States—German.  
Japanese—Austrian Northern.  
Officers of the Asiatic Steamer  
P. & O. S. N. Co. China & Manila S. S. Co.  
Messer Maritim. Steamship & Co.  
Messer M. S. S. Co. H. C. & M. S. B. Co.  
Indo-China S. N. Co. British Oriental S. S. Co.  
Douglas S. S. Co. Miscellaneous Coast  
China Mer. S. N. Co. Steamers.

THE LIST OF RESIDENTS now contains  
the names of  
THIRTEEN THOUSAND AND FIVE HUNDRED  
FOREIGNERS  
arranged under one Alphabet in the strictest  
order, the initials as well as the surnames  
being alphabetical.

The MAPS and PLANS have been mostly  
reduced to a smaller scale and brought up  
to date. They now consist of  
MAPS of MERCANTILE HOUSES IN CHINA.  
CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE AT VICTORIA PEAK.  
MAP OF THE FAIR EAST.  
MAP OF THE ISLAND OF HONGKONG.  
PLAN OF THE CITY OF VICTORIA.  
PLAN OF MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, V. CHINA.  
PLAN OF FOREST CONCESSIONS, SHANGHAI.  
PLAN OF MANILA.  
PLAN OF SAIGON.  
PLAN OF TOWN AND ENVIRONS OF SINGAPORE.  
PLAN OF GEORGE TOWN, PEGANG.

Among the other contents of the book are—  
An Almanac, Chinese Calendar, Mean of Harmonies and Thermometer, Rainfall, &c.

A full Chronology of remarkable events since  
the advent of foreigners to China and Japan.

A description of Chinese Festivals, Fasts, &c.,  
with the days on which they fall.

Comparative Tables of Money, Weights, &c.  
New Scale of Hongkong Stamp Duties.  
The Hongkong Postage Guide.

Almanac of the Chinese Year of Metal and Panel  
Post as at from London and Hongkong.

Scales of Commissions and Charges adopted by  
the Chamber of Commerce of Hongkong.

Hongkong Chair, Jairicks, and Boat Hire.

The APPENDIX consists of  
FOUR HUNDRED PAGES  
of closely printed matter, to which reference is  
constantly required by residents and those  
having commercial or political relations with the  
Countries embraced within the scope of the  
CHRONICLE and DIRECTORY.

The Contents of the Appendix are too numerous to recapitulate in an Advertisement, but  
INCLUDE—  
TREATIES WITH CHINA—  
Great Britain, Tientsin, 1842  
Treaty of Tientsin, 1858  
and all others not abrogated.

France, Tientsin, 1858  
Convention, 1850  
Tientsin, 1855  
Treaty of Commerce, 1856.  
United States, Tientsin, 1858  
Additional, 1859  
Peking, 1860  
German, Tientsin, 1861  
Peking, 1860  
Russia, Japan, Spain, Brazil, and Peru.  
TREATIES WITH JAPAN—  
Great Britain—Netherlands  
United States—Corse  
TREATIES WITH COREA  
TREATIES WITH ANNAM  
TREATIES WITH CAMBODIA  
CUSTOMS TAFFES—  
Chinese—Siamese  
Japanese—Corean

LEGAL ORDERS  
Orders in Council for Government of H. M. S.  
Subsidy in China and Japan, 1865, 1877,  
1875, 1881, 1884, 1886.  
Regulations of H. M. S. Supreme and other Courts  
in China and Japan.

Tables of Consular Fees  
Code of Civil Procedure, Hongkong  
Table of Hongkong Court Fees  
Admiralty Rules  
Foreign Jurisdiction Act  
Regulations of the Consular Courts of United  
States of China  
Rules of Court of Consuls at Shanghai  
Chinese Passenger Act  
TRADE REGULATIONS  
China—Siam  
Japan—Customs Seizure, China  
Customs and Harbour Regulations for the dif-  
ferent ports of China, Philippines, Siam, &c.  
Pilotage Regulations  
Hongkong  
Charter of the Colony  
New Rules of Legislative Council  
Port Regulations  
&c., &c., &c.

Orders may be sent to Daily Press Office, when  
it is published, or to the following Agents—  
MACAO.....Messrs. G. & J. Co.  
AMOY.....Messrs. C. Gerard & Co.  
FOENHOA.....Messrs. G. Gerard & Co.  
NINGPO.....Messrs. Hodgo & Co.  
SHANGHAI.....Messrs. Kelly & Walsh  
NORTHERN & HALL & HOKE CO-OPERATIVE CO.  
RIVER PORTS & HALL & HOKE CO-OPERATIVE CO.  
TAKAO & TAIPEH.....Messrs. T. & S. Shih  
HOKO, OKAHA.....Messrs. P. Walsh & Co.  
YOKOHAMA.....Messrs. Kelly & Walsh  
MANILA.....Messrs. Diaz Puerto & Co.  
SANJON.....Messrs. Schrodler Frères & Co.  
Gardes.

HANOI.....Mr. F. Mainfray.

HAIPHONG.....Mr. G. Gavell.

CHINCHING.....Messrs. G. & J. Co.

PENGHU.....Messrs. Maynard & Co.

CALCUTTA.....Messrs. Newmarr & Co.

SYDNEY.....Messrs. Gordon & Gotech.

MELBOURNE.....Messrs. Norton, Hargrave & Co.

BRISBANE.....Messrs. Gordon & Gotech.

LONDON.....Messrs. G. & J. Ferguson.

EDINBURGH.....Messrs. G. & J. Ferguson.

NEW YORK.....Mr. F. Algar, Clement's Lane.

LONDON.....Messrs. Scott & Son, Cornhill.

LONDON.....Mr. W. W. Wills, 151 Cannon St.

SAN FRANCISCO.....Mr. L. P. Fisher, 21 Merchant's Exchange.

NEW YORK.....Mr. A. Wind, 21 Park Row,  
Daily Press Office, January 1887.

## INTIMATIONS.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LIMITED,  
are now offering for Sale at greatly reduced  
prices the remainder of their  
SEASON'S STOCK  
OF  
CHRISTMAS CONFECTIONERY,  
Comprising—  
CRYSTALLIZED FIGS,  
APRICOTS, GREENGAGES, &c.  
BOXED FRUITS, FIGS,  
RAISINS, JORDAN ALMONDS,  
ASSORTED FRENCH SWEETS,  
CHOCOLATES, FANCY BOXES,  
CRACKERS,  
&c., &c., &c.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LIMITED,  
HONGKONG DISPENSARY.  
Hongkong, 14th January, 1887. [22]

### NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications on Editorial matters should be addressed to "The Editor," and those on business "The Manager," and not to individuals by name.  
Correspondents are requested to forward their name and address with communications addressed to the Editor, not for publication, but as evidence of good faith.  
All letters for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.  
Advertisements and Subscriptions which are not desired for a fixed period will be continued until otherwise notified.  
Orders for extra copies of the Daily Press should be sent before 11 a.m. on the day of publication. After that hour supply is limited.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, FEBRUARY 4TH, 1887.

At the last Criminal Sessions a prosecution of two women on a charge of bringing females into the colony for improper purposes broke down, as the charge was first framed, owing to a defect in the Ordinance; though when the charge was afterwards framed in a different manner, the accused met with their deserts. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to individuals not of Chinese nationality. The Ordinance under which the charge was first laid was No. 2 of 1875, which was passed "for the better protection of Chinese women and female children, and for the repression of certain abuses in relation to Chinese emigration." The females who were the subject of the offence in the case referred to were Annamite, and not Chinese. Mr. Bassett, counsel for the defence, took the point that the case did not come within the purview of the Ordinance, arguing that as that measure was passed specifically for the protection of Chinese women and children it did not extend to



## INSURANCES

MANHUEH REINSURANCE COMPANY.  
The Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Company are prepared to GRANT POLICIES on MARINE RISKS at Current Rates.

Hongkong, 1st January, 1887. [27]

## NOTICE.

QUEEN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The Undersigned Agents for the above Company are prepared to ACCEPT RISKS on FIRST-CLASS GODOWNS at 1 per cent. Net premium per Annum.

Hongkong, 2d May, 1881. [109]

AMICABLE INSURANCE OFFICE, LIMITED (OF CALCUTTA).

The Undersigned are prepared to GRANT POLICIES on MARINE RISKS at Current Rates.

GIEB, LIVINGSTON & CO., Agents.

Hongkong, 27th September, 1886. [17]

THE MAN ON INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

HEAD OFFICE—HONG KONG.

CAPITAL (SUBSCRIBED), \$100,000.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

WAN SING, Esq.

BAN HUP, Esq. YOW CHONG P. No. Eng.

CHAN LI CHOY, Esq. Q. HOI CHUN, Esq.

The Company GRANTS POLICIES on MARINE RISKS in all parts of the World, payable at any of its Agencies.

Contributory Dividends are payable to all Contributors of Business, whether they are Shareholders or not.

WOO LIN YUEN, Secretary.

HEAD OFFICE,

No. 2 Queen's Road, West.

Hongkong, 14th March, 1881. [1751]

## NOTICE.

THE CHINA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

Is prepared to ACCEPT FIRST-CLASS RISKS at 1%, not per Annum, and other Insurance rates.

AGENTS for all the Treaty Ports of China and Japan, and at Singapore, Penang, and the Philippines.

JAS. B. COUGHTRIE, Secretary.

Hongkong, 27th March, 1882. [174]

NOR' GERMAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY AT HAMBURG.

The Undersigned, having been appointed Agents for the above Company, are prepared to GRANT INSURANCES to the extent of \$60,000, on first-class risks at current rates.

MELCHERS & Co.

Hongkong, 27th March, 1876. [12]

TRANSATLANTIC FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF HAMBURG.

The Undersigned, having been appointed Agents for the above Company, are prepared to ACCEPT RISKS against FIRE at Current Rates.

KELLY & WALSH, W. BREWER, LANE, CRAWFORD & CO.

## FOR SALE.

CHAS. H. E. D. SIECK'S CHAMPAGNE, 1850 WHITE SEAL.

\$2.00 per case of 1 dozen quarts.

\$2.00 per case of 2 dozen pints.

CLARET CHATEAU LAPOUSE.

\$2.00 per case of 1 dozen quarts.

\$1.00 per case of 2 dozen pints.

PONTET CANET.

\$0.50 per case of 1 dozen quarts.

PALMER MARGAUX.

\$7.50 per case of 1 dozen quarts.

\$8.50 per case of 2 dozen pints.

LOEMONT.

\$5.00 per case of 1 dozen quarts.

JOHN LEWIS & SONS OLD HIGHLAND WHISKY.

\$8.00 per case of dozen bottles.

CAUTER PALMER & CO'S WINES AND SPIRITS.

ESTABLISHED 1804.

THE Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Company are prepared to issue Policies of Insurance against Fire on the usual terms.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.

Hongkong, January, 1882. [199]

FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF 1877 IN HAMBURG.

The Undersigned Agents of the above Company, are authorized to INSURE against FIRE at Current Rates.

GHILMAN & CO.

Hongkong, 1st January, 1882. [16]

CALEDONIAN FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1804.

THE Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Company are prepared to issue Policies of Insurance against Fire on the usual terms.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.

Hongkong, January, 1882. [199]

THE LONDON ASSURANCE INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER OF HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE THE FIRST.

A.D. 1720.

The Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Corporation, are prepared to GRANT POLICIES against FIRE at Current Rates.

W. G. HUMPHREYS & CO., Bank Buildings.

Hongkong, 1st January, 1886. [36]

## NOW ON SALE.

IMPERIAL QUARTO.

ENGLISH AND CHINESE DICTIONARY WITH THE PUNI AND MANDARIN PRONUNCIATION.

An Anglo-Chinese Dictionary, published at the Daily Press Office, Hongkong.

For comprehensiveness and practical service this Work stands unrivaled. All the new words which the Chinese have of late years been compelled to adopt to express the numerous objects in machinery, science, the ledger, and in science generally, which the rapid advance of foreign relations has imposed upon them, are here given in *extenso*. Each and every word is fully illustrated and explained, forming exercises for students of a most instructive nature. Both the Court and Punji pronunciations are given the accents being carefully marked on the best principles hitherto attained. The typography is clear and distinct, the staves are well spaced, and in size, thereby effecting a vast economy of space, achieving a clearness not previously attained and dispensed with those vast margins and vacant spaces which have heretofore characterized Chinese publications.

To illustrate the vast scope of the work following extracts submitted for confirmation.

Chinese characters and Mandschou English and Chinese Dictionary about 100,000 words, whilst this work contains more than 30,000 English words, and upwards of 600,000 Chinese characters.

Again, despite all the grammars and other elementary works as yet published, the study of this difficult language absolutely requires examples to display the various applications and equivalents of different words which are not to be found in any one work.

Also, the great number of Chinese words in this work contains more than five times as many as any other Dictionary hitherto published.

For practical purposes the arrangement of the work is so complete, that a reference to its pages enables a person who understands English to communicate effectively with natives who understand Chinese.

In this way the student attains a knowledge of the work which is far superior to that obtained by reading any other book.

To parties resident in England and interested in China it cannot but be invaluable occasionally.

It comprises upwards of two thousand large page numbers.

A Large REDUCTION in PRICE is made to Purchasers of SIX or more Copies.

LONDON & CO., 60 PATERNOSTER ROW, HONGKONG.

"DAILY PRESS" OFFICE, WYNDHAM ST.

THE LATEST ADVANCE IN LIFE INSURANCE.

THE NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S 5 YEAR DIVIDEND POLICY.

THIS Policy secures the insured the option of retaining his dividend at the end of any 5 Year Period, and receiving for his share of accumulated surplus together with a dividend. If death occur, the full amount of the Policy will be paid immediately or proof of death, together with a Mortuary Dividend of 50 per cent of all premiums received during the 5 Year period in which death may happen.

Prospects and full particulars may be had on application to:

GIBB, LIVINGSTON & CO., Acting Agents.

Hongkong, 13th January, 1887. [61]

THE PACIFIC MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO.

The Undersigned having been appointed AGENT for the above named Company is prepared to grant POLICIES on European and Chinese Lives at current rates.

FRID. NAUDIN.

Hongkong, 1st February, 1887. [264]

NOW ON SALE.

MAIL TABLES.

FOR SALE.

NOW READY MAIL TABLES.

1887.

WEEK DAYS.

SUNDAYS.

Leave Hongkong Monday

6.00 A.M. 7.00 A.M. 6.00 A.M. 7.00 A.M.

6.00 " 8.25 " 7.30 " 6.00 "

6.45 " 10.15 " 10.30 " 10.45 "

10.45 " 10.55 " 11.00 " 12.20 NOON

11.15 " 12.25 P.M. 12.25 P.M. 1.15 P.M.

1.35 " 1.55 " 2.20 " 2.20 "

2.20 " 2.65 " 3.25 " 3.25 "

3.25 " 3.55 " 4.10 " 4.25 "

4.20 " 5.10 " 5.25 " 5.45 "

5.25 " 5.45 " 6.30 " 6.45 "

6.35 " 6.45 " 7.00 " 7.00 "

7.00 " 7.45 " 8.15 " 8.45 "

8.25 " 8.55 " 9.10 " 9.45 "

9.45 " 10.15 " 10.45 " 11.15 "

10.45 " 11.15 " 11.45 " 12.20 NOON

11.15 " 12.25 P.M. 12.25 P.M. 1.15 P.M.

1.35 " 1.55 " 2.20 " 2.20 "

2.20 " 2.65 " 3.25 " 3.25 "

3.25 " 3.55 " 4.10 " 4.25 "

4.20 " 5.10 " 5.25 " 5.45 "

5.25 " 5.45 " 6.30 " 6.45 "

6.35 " 6.45 " 7.00 " 7.00 "

7.00 " 7.45 " 8.15 " 8.45 "

8.25 " 8.55 " 9.10 " 9.45 "

9.45 " 10.15 " 10.45 " 11.15 "

10.45 " 11.15 " 11.45 " 12.20 NOON

11.15 " 12.25 P.M. 12.25 P.M. 1.15 P.M.

1.35 " 1.55 " 2.20 " 2.20 "

2.20 " 2.65 " 3.25 " 3.25 "

3.25 " 3.55 " 4.10 " 4.25 "

4.20 " 5.10 " 5.25 " 5.45 "

5.25 " 5.45 " 6.30 " 6.45 "

6.35 " 6.45 " 7.00 " 7.00 "

7.00 " 7.45 " 8.15 " 8.45 "

8.25 " 8.55 " 9.10 " 9.45 "

9.45 " 10.15 " 10.45 " 11.15 "

10.45 " 11.15 " 11.45 " 12.20 NOON

11.15 " 12.25 P.M. 12.25 P.M. 1.15 P.M.

1.35 " 1.55 " 2.20 " 2.20 "

2.20 " 2.65 " 3.25 " 3.25 "

3.25 " 3.55 " 4.10 " 4.25 "

4.20 " 5.10 " 5.25 " 5.45 "